

U.S. Serial No.: 10/067,446

**REMARKS****I. Introduction**

Claims 1-24 are pending in the above application.

Claims 1-3, 8, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**II. Rejection Under § 112 ¶ 2**

Claims 1-3, 8, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as allegedly being indefinite. The Office action alleges that “the phrase ‘service ticket’ is indefinite as it is unclear how applicant is defining the phrase. The usage of the phrase in the claims is different than the definition provided in the specification. The specification appears to use the term to mean ticket granting ticket.” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The phrase “service ticket” is clearly defined in the specification at least at page 7, line 18-20 and page 12 line 22 through page 13 line 24. Further, the phrase TGT (ticket granting ticket) and its relation to a service ticket is also clearly discussed at least at page 7, lines 13 through page 8, line 18 and illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2. Applicant’s usage of the term “service ticket” in the claims is not different than provided in the specification.

Moreover, as clearly explained in the specification, the term “service ticket” does not mean “ticket granting ticket”. As explained in the specification, “the AS server 108 issues a ticket granting ticket (TGT ticket) to the client 102 after verifying its credentials. The TGS server 110 provides an application server service ticket (ST ticket) to the client 102.” More particularly, client 102 requests TGT ticket from AS server 108 via message AS\_REQ; AS server 108 replies to the client 102 with TGT ticket via message AS\_REP; client 102 requests an

U.S. Serial No.: 10/067,446

ST ticket from TGS server 110 via message TGS\_REQ; and TGS server provides client 102 with an ST ticket via message TGS\_REP. See, page 8, lines 1-10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection to be withdrawn.

### III. Prior Art Rejections

A. Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Windows 2000 Kerbos Authentication White Paper (hereafter the Kerbos article).<sup>1</sup>

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed in a prior art reference as arranged in the claim. See, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

The Kerbos article does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-24. More particularly, the Kerbos article does not disclose to use more than one copy of authorization data as recited by claims 1, 15, 18 and 24. The Kerbos article merely discloses to use two steps to gather authentication data. Kerbos, pg 27. The first step is to prepare a TGT and the second step is to prepare a session ticket. Kerbos, pg. 27. Contrary to the allegation in the Office action, in the Kerbos article, the session ticket is not a copy of the TGT, rather it is separate data. Kerbos clearly does not disclose to provide more than one copy of authorization data.

As the Kerbos article does not disclose each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 15, 18 or 24, the Kerbos article does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, the Kerbos article also does not anticipate claims 2-14, 16-18, and 19-23 which depend on independent claims 1, 15 and 18, respectively, and incorporate all of the limitations thereof, respectively.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant notes that the Office action cites to page 32 of the Kerbos article. However, the copy of the Kerbos article provided to Applicant has only 29 pages. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a complete copy of the Kerbos article.

U.S. Serial No.: 10/067,446

**IV. Conclusion**

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: 12/29/05

Respectfully submitted,

By: Lawrence T. Cullen  
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions  
101 Tournament Drive  
Horsham, PA 19044  
(215) 323-1797